



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1998

No. 137

## Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, October 2, 1998)

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Sovereign of this Nation and Lord of our lives, grant us Your peace for the pressures of this week. May Your peace keep us calm when tensions mount and serene when strain causes stress. Remind us that You are in control and that there is enough time to do what You want us to accomplish.

Fill this Senate Chamber with Your presence. May we hear Your whisper in our souls, "Be not afraid; I am with you." Bless the women and men of this Senate with a special measure of Your strength for the demanding schedule ahead. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 2 p.m. Following morning business, it will be the leaders' intention to begin consideration of the agriculture appropriations conference report under a short time agreement. The Senate may also resume consideration of S. 442, the Internet tax bill. At 5:30 p.m., under a previous order, the Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 10, the financial services modernization bill.

Further votes could occur following the cloture vote in relation to the mo-

tion to proceed, and if consent is granted, a vote on or in relation to the agriculture conference report, the Internet tax bill, or any other legislative or executive items cleared for action.

Members are reminded that a cloture petition was filed on Friday to the Internet tax bill. That vote will occur immediately following the adoption of the motion to proceed to the financial modernization bill, if cloture is invoked today at 5:30 p.m.

In addition, as a result of cloture being filed on the Internet bill on Friday, members have until 1 p.m. today to file first-degree amendments to the Internet bill.

Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the control of Senator MACK begin at 12 noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes with the following exceptions: The Senator from Missouri controls the time until 12 noon; the Senator from Florida, Mr. MACK, 15 minutes; the Senator from Montana, Mr. BAUCUS, controls the time from 1 p.m. until 2 p.m.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, thank you.

### TAX CUTS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to begin a discussion today which should clarify some of the competing rhetoric and certainly some of the misinformation that is being spoken about the potential for tax cuts in our culture.

We are taxed at the highest rates in history. Never before have the American people been asked to devote so much of their hard-earned resources to government. Yet there are lots of statements made about the incapacity of this government to afford tax cuts to the American people, to give them some more of what they have earned in return for their hard work.

I rise today to speak the truth about tax cuts, to speak the truth about the so-called emergency spending, about Social Security, and about the budget surplus. A group of like-minded Senators and I have been engaged in a long and arduous fight to return to the American taxpayers more of their own money. We are here to announce that we are not giving up that fight. It may now be clear that the Senate will not be passing a tax cut this year.

Even if the majority leader were to bring the House-passed bill to the floor, there are just too many Members, big spenders, if you will, who are more interested in spending the surplus than returning the surplus to the rightful owners—those who generated the surplus. I only wish the advocacy groups who attack tax cuts would be honest enough to criticize the President and the other big spenders as they spend the surplus on more and more government programs and projects.

Senators INHOFE, GRAMS, BROWNBACK, BOB SMITH and I have waged a long battle, battle after battle, as a matter of

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S11401

fact, since May of this year, when we opposed the Senate Budget Committee resolution, because it contained only \$30 billion in tax cuts over the next 5 years. Because of our strong and vocal opposition to that particular measure, our leadership made a commitment to us to fight for more tax relief, to adopt the House-passed tax cut number, to make eliminating the marriage penalty a priority of the Senate in a tax cut bill, and to move the budget reconciliation package so that tax cuts would be protected.

In June, the House did pass a budget resolution that included \$101 billion in tax relief. The other Senators and I, in accordance with the previous agreement with the leadership of this House, assumed that this would be the amount of tax relief that would be delivered to hard-working Americans this year. You have \$101 billion in the House and an agreement by the Senate that it will go to the House figure; you would think you would be able to get to \$101 billion.

As the August recess loomed before us, the tax cuts remained elusive. That is why on July 17, a group of Senators and I came to the floor during consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill and attempted to add a marriage penalty elimination amendment to that bill. To eliminate the marriage penalty would effectively reduce taxes for about 21 million couples who are penalized simply because they are married. Our point was simple and clear: Congress should not receive the funding under the legislative branch appropriations before the American people got the opportunity to keep a reasonable amount of what they earned. Why give all the money that Congress wants to Congress while we don't honor the need for the American people to fund their families?

We were prevented from offering our amendment at that time by the Democrats. We came back 2 weeks later while this body was considering the Treasury-Postal Services appropriations bill and we offered our amendment again. Our amendment would have eliminated the unfair and discriminatory marriage penalty, that extra tax that people pay just because they are married, which affects 21 million American families to the tune of about \$29 billion a year.

We did not rely on spending the surplus in order to advocate that tax cut. We called for reductions in spending. We said that the Government has been on a budget high in fat for too long, it is time for us to provide the people with some relief, and we should do that by cutting spending. So we called for reductions in spending to offset the reduced revenues that would have come as a result of the tax cut.

On July 29, a majority of the individuals serving in this Senate voted in favor of eliminating the marriage penalty when they voted not to table our amendment. A majority of the Senate said that it is time to stop imposing Washington's values on the people and

start imposing the people's values on Washington. The marriage penalty is perhaps one of the best examples of an elitist Washington imposing its values on the principles of the American people. We know that the American people understand the value of marriage and families in our culture. We know that they understand that if we expect to succeed in the next century, if we don't want to sink, if we want to swim, we had better make it possible for families to meet their needs. One way to do that is to stop penalizing people for being families, and we ought to do that.

Unfortunately, we had to withdraw the amendment because of the constitutional requirement that revenue bills originate in the House of Representatives. But the Senate did go on record supporting a marriage penalty elimination—this tax cut. A majority of this body voted to support eliminating the marriage penalty, but today we are facing the disappointing reality that the Senate will not pass, or probably will not even vote on, tax relief.

Much has been made about the surplus that is now attendant to the financial situation in Washington. Last week, the President happily announced that, for the first time in almost 30 years, the Federal budget is in balance—not just in balance, but there is a budget surplus of almost \$70 billion. President Clinton even took credit for the balanced budget and the budget surplus.

Well, who is really responsible for the budget surplus? Was it the President and his party who voted for the largest tax increase in American history in 1993? Or was it the Republicans who made balancing the budget a national priority? Let me suggest that it wasn't the President, and let me suggest that it wasn't the Republicans, but that it was the American people who continued to work hard, to pay their taxes, continued to demand from their elected officials that we have some fiscal discipline. The American people should be credited with balancing the budget through their hard work, creativity, innovation, and their industry. Government doesn't generate revenue, it doesn't create wealth, people do, when they work hard.

Make no mistake, the Federal budget surplus is up because Federal income taxes are up. Income tax revenues have increased \$83.7 billion, or 11 percent, just since last year. Where do those tax revenues come from? They come from the American people.

The President's record on taxes is threefold: Increase, increase, and increase. He has not proposed cutting taxes. Rather, his latest budget proposed increasing taxes by \$100 billion over the next 5 years. Americans pay more in taxes today than they have in any other time in our history. President Clinton raised taxes by \$242 billion in 1993, the largest hike in U.S. history, and sought to increase them another \$290 billion as part of his plan

to nationalize the Nation's health care system in 1994. And he sought to increase taxes by another \$500 billion plus this year as part of a tobacco tax bill. In 1995, he vetoed the first major tax cut since Ronald Reagan was President. We all remember when the President mused aloud about his 1993 tax increase. He put it this way: "It might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too."

Well, frankly, I believe the President is right that he raised taxes too much. If we raised taxes too much, wouldn't it behoove us to begin to settle the account and start to let the American people have some of their hard-earned resources for expenditure in their families? It is one thing to confess that you raised taxes too much; it is another thing to develop another plan to spend all that you raised when you raised too much. If he really believes we raised taxes too much, we should give some of these hard-earned resources back. The President seems to have forgotten that it is the American people who have led us to this budget surplus. It is their money, not our money.

Mr. President, I have not forgotten this key fact. That is why I am here today—to say to the American people that they deserve not to have their money squandered on more Government, but they deserve a return on their investment—a return in the form of tax relief that is funded by reducing the spending of a Government addicted to a high-fat diet. This Government should be involved in reducing its invasion of the American culture with more and more Government and thereby consuming more and more of what families need to meet their needs.

Now, the President has a plan, but his plan is to spend the surplus. When it became clear earlier in the year that the fiscal discipline the Republican Congress had demanded from the President would result in a budget surplus, the President made a statement in his State of the Union Address which he has repeated numerous times since then. He said this, and I have this statement on a chart here:

But whether the issue is tax cuts or spending, I ask all of you to meet this test: Approve only those priorities that can actually be accomplished without adding a dime to the deficit. Now, if we balance the budget for next year, it is projected that we will then have a sizable surplus in the years that immediately follow. What should we do with this projected surplus? I have a simple four-word answer: Save Social Security first. Tonight, I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus—that's every penny of any surplus—until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen the Social Security system for the 21st century.

That is quite a statement. It is a bold statement. The President has used this statement to attack our plan to eliminate the marriage penalty and provide tax relief. He has used this sort of suggestion that we will just have to save Social Security and therefore you can't have any tax relief for the American people—a tax relief package that we

were and are prepared to pay for out of reduced spending. But has the President attempted to keep his pledge to use every penny to save Social Security? There is only one answer. That answer is a resounding no.

Only days after his Social Security pledge, he sent a budget to Congress that contained \$150 billion in new spending, according to the Senate Budget Committee. Without that new spending, the surplus would have been \$150 billion larger—hardly every penny of any surplus being used to save Social Security.

It seems like every week the President has proposed an additional new spending program. His fiscal year 1999 budget, submitted earlier in the year, contained \$150 billion in new spending. Just last Thursday, the President was at it again. At a press conference at the White House, he repeated his call for \$34 billion to run our schools from Washington and to take control of our children's education away from their parents and teachers with new Federal expenditures of resources that are hard-earned by the American people, which he won't allow them to keep to fund their families.

The President called for this new spending, as with all his spending requests, without a dime of offsetting savings. He is not talking about reallocating Federal expenditures, he is talking about increasing Federal expenditures. That means it can only be financed by dipping into the same surplus that he pledged would be spent for Social Security.

Every penny of any surplus—the President said, should be reserved until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen Social Security.

The President is gifted with language, so now we're redefining the phrase, every penny.

It reminds me of the fellow who sat down to dinner every night and put his finger in the wine glass and flipped a little wine off his fingers. His friend said to him, "Why do you do that? Every night you come in, stick your finger in the wine glass, and you flip the wine off your finger." He said, "Well, I promised my mother on her deathbed that I would never drink a drop of wine. And that is the drop I am not drinking."

The truth of the matter is that the President has said we are going to devote every penny of the surplus to Social Security, and there are not any pennies there—just dollars, and billions of dollars. So we are free to spend the billions of dollars. Those are the pennies we are not saving but flipping them off our finger because they are not there.

In addition to all the increased spending that the President has asked for—spending that breaks the budget caps—this body will be called upon to vote for a package that includes at least \$17.8 billion to pay for so-called emergencies—and I will go into what those quote-emergencies-unquote are

shortly—that will be paid for out of the surplus.

The truth is, they have done nothing to save Social Security. They have no proposal. They tried to discredit tax cuts by saying cutting taxes would impair Social Security. They might impair some other invasive government programs but not Social Security. But this is a way of trying to fight against any reduction in government, any ability of this Senate to try to say to families you need to be able to fund your needs rather than just be used as workers to fund the ambitious schemes of spending and big government.

The truth is that the big spenders don't care about saving Social Security or balancing the budget. They care about reserving their ability to spend the taxpayers' money.

They do not want their ability to spend curtailed in any way—they want the amounts to continue to increase, and they want to stop any tax cut that infringes on their spending power.

They look at this surplus as an huge pot of money to finance all their pork barrel pet projects. There is no fiscal discipline here! There is only a strong commitment, an all consuming passion to prevent tax cuts at any expense—even if it means misleading the American people by their demagoguery about saving social security.

The President said he wanted to save Social Security; devote every penny. The President and the big spenders have feigned their concern for Social Security and fiscal responsibility. It is a mantra that has been repeated thousands of times—sort of a slogan that any time there is a problem, they run and hide behind the Social Security billboards. They stick their heads into the ground and yell, "Social Security," so they can avoid dealing with issues that count.

I guess we can expect to hear that mantra another thousand more times in the next month preceding the election. But it is also clear that when we look at the President's record on Social Security reform, that he talks the talk but then takes a walk.

Despite promising to save Social Security first, the President has never proposed a plan to reform Social Security—not even hinted at it. Clinton's one and only proposal related to Social Security was to promote and to sign into law a \$25 billion tax increase for some Social Security beneficiaries. For all his rhetoric, not one plan—not one concrete proposal—to preserve the Social Security program.

Social Security merely becomes a tool in his hand to try to divert attention from the opportunity to cut government spending and provide Americans with the opportunity to fund their families rather than to fund the bureaucracy.

While a series of bills have been introduced by Republicans and Democrats addressing Social Security solvency, Congress is still, to this day, waiting upon a plan from the President.

But the President has one goal, and that is to spend the surplus, and spend it as quickly as he can. Unfortunately, the President is not alone in this goal. It appears that a majority of the Senate is opposed to cutting taxes or cutting spending. They are only interested in one thing as well—stopping tax relief so that they can spend the surplus themselves.

The President has presented to the American people a false choice—he said it has to be either this or this—and it is a false choice. He has said it is a choice between saving Social Security and Squandering the Surplus on tax relief. But this is a misleading choice. It doesn't have to be one or the other. We can take the surplus, devote it to Social Security, and we can provide tax relief by cutting some of the spending that is wasteful and inappropriate by a bureaucracy which is bloated.

I believe we can do both. But only if we do not spend the surplus on increased government, as is currently being planned. Congress is planning to spend at least \$17.8 billion of the surplus next week in the "emergency supplemental" bill. And we can be sure that the \$17.8 billion figure will continue to grow exponentially by the time this Congress adjourns.

Mr. President, the Administration's spending requests during this Congress have become more than a bad habit. These requests reveal a consistent failure at responsible governance. Twenty billion dollars or more in "emergency" appropriations may be requested before this Congress adjourns.

Billions of these dollars will pay for expenditures the Administration knew it would incur. What are we talking about? These aren't surprise expenditures. These aren't emergencies that have come up. These are expenditures that have long been planned to be put into the emergency spending portion of the budget so they wouldn't come under the caps—so they wouldn't come under the normal limits that are related to balancing the budget.

First, the administration did not realize—according to this, if it is an emergency—the year 2000 would follow the year 1999. It requested \$3.25 billion to clean up the year 2000 computer problem. Why wasn't that in the ordinary spending appropriations request?

Did anyone in the Administration have a calendar? Not only is the emergency designation of Y2K funding wrong, but experts in the field have informed my office that the Administration could have corrected this computing problem for far less money if the process had been stated earlier.

So instead, the administration proposes to raid the surplus and to spend money that could have been used to save Social Security.

Every penny? Maybe there haven't been any pennies, just dollars.

Second, the administration claims it did not know that we would continue to deploy troops in Bosnia next year. This is an "emergency"—that somehow

the Bosnia deployment is unanticipated.

It has been apparent from the beginning of NATO's Implementation Force (IFOR) that American troops were there to stay much longer than the President had initially promised the American people three years ago.

In dispatching over 22,000 U.S. soldiers to participate in the NATO Bosnia mission in 1995 and 1996, the President told the American people that the mission would take about one year. Secretary of Defense William Perry and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs John Shalikashvili both confirmed the one-year duration of NATO's Implementation Force (IFOR). Secretary Perry testified before the House International Relations Committee that the total cost of the Bosnia mission would be about \$2 billion.

Now, three years later, after two broken troop withdrawal deadlines and over \$6 billion in cost, the Administration is seeking to fund this operation straight out of the surplus, which could be used, if we were to take the President at his word, to save Social Security. The President announced in December of 1997 that American troops would stay in Bosnia indefinitely, and yet he asked for an emergency appropriations of \$1.9 billion for fiscal year 1999 operational costs.

Next the Administration proposed to spend the surplus that he proposed be used to save Social Security on building embassies overseas. Yet, after the tragic bombings of Kenya and Tanzania, the State Department could not even tell the Congress how much money they had spent to upgrade embassy security to meet standards set forth in the Inman Report of 1985. An effective accounting system to track these funds had not been established.

A failure to monitor where the money has been going is not the only problem. In recent years, the State Department has not even spent all the money appropriated by Congress for diplomatic security. In 1995 and 1996, the State Department failed to spend \$100 million appropriated by Congress to enhance the security of U.S. overseas posts but now they want to raid the surplus in a so-called "emergency."

Mr. President, this administration has not managed fiscal resources in a manner which inspires confidence. The administration will spend over \$550 billion in discretionary spending under the budget agreement, but instead of paying for these new spending requests from some other part of the budget, the administration wants to raid the surplus that would save Social Security.

The real outrage is that the President plans to spend the surplus, not to preserve Social Security. The truth is that the President and some in the Congress have misled the American people about their plans for the surplus. They have no intention of saving the surplus to fix Social Security. They have no plan to fix Social Security. Their plan is to spend the surplus on

fake emergencies and increase spending. They are unwilling to use the budget process to live within the budget caps to finance their spending, so they categorize items as emergencies so that they don't have to exist within the framework and discipline that would characterize any family's budget. We have caps on our spending at home. We have limits on what we can take and spend. We can't decide we are going to call something an emergency and create resources out of thin air. It can't be done by the American people. It shouldn't be done by the American President and Congress. So we, the Congress, end up denying hard-working Americans a tax cut and we scare senior citizens about the future of Social Security, and then they spend the surplus.

One of the things we end up spending the surplus on is pork projects. There are many additional spending items that are being talked about for the omnibus appropriations emergency spending behemoth. I do not mean to say all of these items are without merit. Indeed, there have been natural disasters, floods, embassy bombings and other occurrences which demand our attention and perhaps some additional funding. But to do it all in an emergency rather than to be addressing in the next funding year, very shortly anyhow, where we would put the funding in the stream of limits and discipline that the budget process imposes is to simply not do our job.

But even these events should not be used to excuse our willingness to deny tax relief or to spend the surplus. The Congress should find the money within the existing budget to pay for these items. As I said before, most of these items are not true emergencies. We have known about Bosnia for a long time. The need to increase our military's readiness we have known, and the Y2K computer problem we have known for years. But by labeling them emergencies, the President wants to use an accounting gimmick to spend the surplus, to spend it outside the normal budget process, and spend it in a way that does not affect the calculation under our spending caps. The fiscally disciplined way to deal with this is to work within the budget, to stop pork barrel spending, and to pay for these priorities.

Mr. President, I want to share with you some of the items contained in the fiscal year 1999 budget in various appropriations bills that the Congress thinks are more important than saving Social Security because they are willing to spend on this kind of pork.

Now, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCain, has done the American people and this body a great service. He has gone through the appropriations bills and he has identified all the earmarked pork programs and put this information on his home page on the Internet. I recommend it to people who want to spend an evening getting a headache reading about additional Federal

spending. Seriously, it is a list that is comprehensive and it is worth looking at. I have looked at the information. Let me share some of it with you. Here are some of the examples of what we are spending for this year, items that the big spenders obviously think are more important than Social Security because they are unwilling to cut these programs in order to save the surplus. If they really wanted these things, thought they were worth it, they should be willing to cut other spending. But they are willing to take them out of the surplus.

Believe you me, if this list of earmarked expenditures that Senator McCain has on his web site were put up in big print, it would be a stack that would be substantial. Here are a couple things. Here is \$3.3 million for the Shrimp Aquaculture project. And let me apologize to the Senate for calling it pork. This isn't pork. This is shrimp. But there is \$3.3 million.

Here is another earmark. Wait a minute. Here is another one that is not pork, either. Pardon me. This is grasshoppers—\$750,000 for grasshopper control research. Here is another—pardon me, not pork, not shrimp, not grasshoppers. Here is \$150,000 to hire a new potato breeder. Here is \$143,200 to continue subterranean termite research.

Well, we have gotten through virtually everything but pork. Let's see if we can find something related to pigs in the process. Obviously, this is political pork, whether or not it is pork in the nutritional sense. Here is \$2 million to unspecified communities in southern California for planning associated with the National Communities Conservation Planning Program. So we have \$2 million for communities to plan to be a part of a planning program. We might call it planning squared, I think—planning for planning. I suppose we could have some additional resources to help people plan for planning to plan. Here is an earmark of \$1.1 million to rehabilitate priest quarters in an old schoolhouse in a national historic site; an earmark of \$1 million for incinerator replacement; an earmark of \$3.4 million to meet uncontrollable costs at a wildlife center located in Wisconsin. "Uncontrollable costs" may be a phrase that seems acceptable in government, but families don't allow for uncontrollable costs. We are not allowed to have uncontrollable costs.

So the bottom line is this. When we are willing to load up our bills with this kind of pork or termites or shrimp or grasshoppers or whatever else it is, it is not about tax cuts, and it is not about saving Social Security. It is about money. It is about spending. It is about power because he who has the money has the power. Someone said it is the Golden Rule: He who has the gold makes the rules. It is a power game here in Washington, and the big spenders just can't allow the American people to control their own money.

Last week, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan appeared before

the Senate Budget Committee and was asked what in his opinion should be done with the surplus. Let's look at his remarks.

My first preference is to allow the surplus to reduce the debt. I am also, however, aware of the pressures that will exist to spend it.

This individual, who perhaps knows as much about Washington and knows as much about this country and its financial caps indicates he knows about . . .

. . . the pressures that will exist to spend it. And that in my judgment would be the worst of all outcomes. And if push came to shove and it was either to spend it or cut taxes, I would strongly and unequivocally be on the side of cutting taxes.

Alan Greenspan happens to know that the growth and intensity, the kind of opportunity that is presented in the American economy is curtailed when we have more and more spending, and that growth and opportunity is enlarged when we have people with more of their money to spend themselves through tax cuts.

That is why he says:

And if push came to shove and it was either to spend it or cut taxes, I would strongly and unequivocally be on the side of cutting taxes.

He stated that to spend the surplus would be the worst of all outcomes, but that is apparently what this President plans to do.

I am sad to inform you, Mr. President, that the worst of all outcomes is about to happen. The pressure to spend is just too strong. I am here today to set the record straight. We cannot let the surplus be spent on mislabeled emergencies and increased spending. We must demand fiscal discipline from this Congress. We should demand truth to senior citizens about the fate of the surplus, and we will demand that the President, who decries tax cuts—we will demand that the President stand accountable for his actions as he prepares to spend the surplus rather than to keep his promise to save Social Security.

The American people will not be fooled. You cannot save Social Security by wasting the surplus on bureaucracy in Washington, DC. You cannot save Social Security when you are sending the elderly's Social Security checks to the shrimp aquaculture project in Hawaii. You cannot save Social Security when the people recognize your posturing for what it is, a political exercise designed not to save Social Security but to save yourself.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity and yield the remainder of my time to my colleagues.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### TAX CUTS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will take just a few moments because I want to sandwich some comments into this

very important discussion on cutting taxes and lowering the rate of impact our Federal Government has on the average American family. The Senator from Missouri has spoken so very clearly today about what is happening, once again, in our Nation's capital. We fought for a decade to balance the budget—and Republicans are proud that it has now happened, it happened on our watch with our fiscal conservatism—but now we have a President who wants to throw up the facade of saving Social Security and yet sending a very large spending package to Capitol Hill. I hope we do have an opportunity to vote for tax cuts. This is one Senator who will proudly cast an "aye" vote for it.

#### PRESIDENTIAL TRAVEL

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thought it would be important this morning to do a short reality check on our President. The President last week said Congress is a do-nothing Congress. They have not done their work. Why has Congress not done its work? You know, when he made that comment about us—and I have been here hour after hour in committee meeting after committee meeting, here on the floor, day after day for the balance of the year—I thought, you know, Mr. President, you challenged me a little bit. It is time to do a reality check. So I sent staff scurrying. We compiled the President's travel log, and what I am about to report to you is the travel log of President Bill Clinton.

For a man who is bent on remaining in the White House, President Clinton sure spends a lot of time away from the White House. What you are about to hear is an analysis of how much time he has spent away, and why his people have not been on the Hill, why they have not been working with us, and now in the closing hours of a Congress he is either threatening a veto or threatening that he might just have to shut down Government to awaken us. Mr. President, let's do a bit of a reality check.

Last year, President Clinton broke the Presidential record for foreign travel with his 27th trip abroad. Like the Energizer Bunny, he has continued to keep on going and going and going. This year so far he has logged 41 days in 11 countries—11 different foreign countries. Some say he is traveling in foreign countries to keep his mind off domestic problems. I would not want to make that assertion. What I do know is that the President has now broken all-time Presidential travel records with 32 trips abroad, more than any other president ever. Mr. President, you are out breaking records.

However, just because President Clinton is not on foreign soil all the time doesn't mean he is in the White House. Bill Clinton also likes to travel around the country as well. He is particularly fond of combining both domestic travel and campaign fundraisers, with at least

37 trips which include fundraisers just through this year, 1998, and there are at least 14 more fundraising events scheduled for October, according to reports. Stay tuned as I go down through this report, because you will find an anomaly between official travel and fundraising travel and what it is costing the taxpayers and maybe why he needs a little bit of supplemental spending.

All told, the President has spent almost half of 1997, 149 days, as well as over half of 1998 so far, 155 days, outside of Washington, DC. Hello, Mr. President, we are trying to get our work done here. You criticize us for being a do-nothing Congress? Mr. President, where have you been?

The President's travel at taxpayers' expense long ago broke the foreign travel record. To put it in perspective, Mr. President, you have traveled domestically over 304 days in the last 2 years. You have already spent more time out of Washington than four out of the last five Congresses have spent in session.

If the implications were not so serious, the President's wanderlust would be a mere fact for amusement, and we could all chortle a little bit about it. This is, after all, a President who has claimed an initiative for every problem and credit for every solution. Yet the President has not been around for much of the work. If America is to believe he is serious about Social Security reform and Medicare reform and health care reform, tax reform and a host of other problems, it would help if they could first believe he is going to be here so we could meet with him to get the work done.

In 1992, then-candidate Bill Clinton excoriated President Bush for taking 25 trips to 60 countries from 1989 to 1993. He stated, "It is time for us to have a President who cares more about Littleton, NH, than Liechtenstein; or more about Manchester than Micronesia." But once in office, guess what? Mr. Clinton took Air Force One and away he went, and he broke the Bush record. In less than 2 years, 1997 through 1998, Clinton has spent almost as many days overseas as Bush spent during his entire term in office—79 versus 86 days. President Clinton has taken 32 foreign trips during his Presidency, 6 more than President Bush, to 78 countries, including 51 different ones. Trips to South Korea, Japan, Malaysia are already in the travel plans for next year.

Mr. President, I could go on and on. The point is quite simple. As America has discovered, just because Mr. Clinton is in the country does not mean he is in the White House. The "DC" in Washington, DC, probably means "Devoid of Clinton." While Clinton was able to leave his passport in the White House, he has made sure he has taken donor cards. As the press has noted, fundraising is prominent in his travel agenda.

What is in the Washington Post today? The President was out once